REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application.
Claims 1-23 are rejected.

The office action dated April 5, 2004 indicates that base claims 1, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choudhury et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,509,074 in view of Pogue et al. 5,144,667; dependent claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choudhury et al. in view of Pogue et al. and Peairs U.S. Patent No. 5,717,940; and base claim 19 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choudhury et al. in view of Pogue and Mandelbaum U.S. Patent No. 5,552,897. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method of using a printer to distribute a document stored on a server. The method includes using the printer to receive an encrypted document from the network; using the printer to decrypt the document; and using the printer to print the decrypted document. Before sending the printer establishes a printer identity with the server.

Choudhury et al. disclose a method in which a document server sends an encrypted document to a printer (col. 4, lines 19-20), and the printer decrypts and prints the document (col. 4, lines 25-26). The printer uses a decryption key, which resides within the printer (col. 4, line 3-7). Choudhury et al. suggest that the decryption key is programmed into the printer. The printer always has the same unique identity. Thus, there is no need and no reason to establish a printer identity with the document server.

Pogue et al. disclose a remote system for unlocking doors in a car. The system 10 includes a remote 14 and a base unit 12. Prior to operation of the system, a secret key (S) is programmed into the remote, and the remote registers with the base unit. Registration includes the base unit sending a public key (P) to the remote, the remote encrypting the public key with the secret key (Q=S(P)), the remote sending the encrypted public key (Q) to the base station, and the base station storing the encrypted public key (Q) along with its copy of (P). The remote does not store the base station's private key (P).

The remote unit broadcasts its ID. When the base unit detects the presence of the remote unit, it challenges the remote to prove its identity. The challenge includes the base station sending the encrypted public key (Q) and a random number (R) to the remote. The remote uses its secret key (S) to decrypt the public key, then uses the decrypted public key to encrypt the random number, and then sends the decrypted random number (P(R)) to the base station. The base station uses its own public key to encrypt the random number, and compares its encrypted random number to the random number encrypted by the remote. If the numbers match, the identity of the remote is proven, and the base station unlocks the car doors.

The office action states that the remote unit is a printer, and the base station is a server. However, Pogue et al. disclose no such thing. This is simply an analogy created by the examiner.

Pogue et al. is non-analogous art. The design of a vehicle security system is not in the field of the applicants' endeavor (distributing and printing of documents), nor is it reasonably pertinent to an architecture for distributing and printing documents. Vehicle security systems are different in structure and

function than document distribution and printing systems. Therefore, Pogue et al. is non-analogous art according to MPEP 2141.01(a) and 2145 (IX).

Pogue et al. give no reason, incentive or motivation for a printer to identify itself to a server. The office action offers a reason (increased security), but this reason is offered for automotive security systems, not document distribution and printing systems.

Thus the documents made of record to not give a person of ordinary skill in the art a reason, incentive or motivation to modify Choudhury et al.'s system such that a printer establishes a printer identity with the server. Therefore the '103 rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-11 should be withdrawn.

Base claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-17 should be allowed for the same reasons. Base claim 18 should be allowed for the same reasons. Base claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-23 should be allowed for the same reasons.

Claim 6 should be allowed for the additional reason that the documents made of record do not teach or suggest ordering a document prior to establishing the printer identity. This step adds an additional level of security during the distribution and printing. The office action states Peairs teaches that documents can be ordered "without regard to printing. The printer identity is not established." Thus, Peairs does not provide a teaching, suggestion or reason to couple the step of ordering a document with the step of establishing a printer identity.

Claim 11 should be allowed for the additional reason that the documents made of record do not teach or suggest the step of using the printer to indicate status of the printing so that the server can charge for copies that were actually printed. This step implies that the printer sends back a status acknowledgement

to the server. Furman, for example, simply uses a server window to give the user feedback that the print job is completed. The status is returned only when requested by a client.

The examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-23. If any issues remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss those remaining issues.